APR 2 6 1994

1

# STATE OF ARIZONA

DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE By

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

OHIO CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY WEST AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY AMERICAN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY

Respondents.

In the Matter of

Docket No. 8216

**CONSENT ORDER** 

# I. INTRODUCTION

A rate examination was made of the Ohio Casualty Group (collectively referred to as the "OHIO"): Ohio Casualty Insurance Company ("OC"), West American Insurance Company ("WA") and American Fire Insurance Company ("AF") by Rate Examiners for the Arizona Department of Insurance ("ADOI"). The ADOI concluded its on site examination of OHIO as of January 2, 1992.

On October 19, 1993, OHIO requested a hearing to challenge the ADOI's rate examination findings. The ADOI issued a hearing notice on October 21, 1993 in response to OHIO's request. On December 27, 1993, the ADOI issued an amended hearing notice. In the amended hearing notice, the ADOI alleged that OHIO violated the provisions of the Arizona Revised Statutes, Sections 20-357, 20-359, 20-383, 20-385, 20-400.01, 20-443, 20-448, 20-451, 20-1113, 20-1676, 20-1677, 20-2002, 23-906 and 23-961. OHIO now wishes to resolve this matter without further formal adjudicative proceedings.

The Arizona Director of Insurance (the "Director") enters the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, which are neither admitted nor denied by OHIO; and with OHIO's consent, the Director enters the following Consent Order.

# II. FINDINGS OF FACT and CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. OHIO is authorized to transact property and casualty insurance, including Workers' Compensation ("WC"), in Arizona pursuant to Certificates of Authority issued by the Director.

2. The National Council of Compensation Insurance (the "NCCI"), a duly licensed rating organization in Arizona, makes rate filings on behalf of its members with the Department. By statute, WC insurers are required to belong to a WC rating organization and to adhere to its rates unless the insurer has filed deviations from these rates. OC, WA and AF are members of NCCI. Any reference to OHIO's filings, or their "filed rates and rules" means rates and rules filed by OHIO with the Department or by the NCCI on behalf of OHIO. Neither OC, WA nor AF has a filed deviation from rates filed by the NCCI.

## 3. OC violated A.R.S. § 20-1113(B) by:

- a. Failing to include Pending Rate Change endorsements on eleven (11) policies, Premium Discount endorsements on four (4) policies, Experience Rating Modification endorsements on one (1) policy and Anniversary Rate Change endorsements on three (3) policies.
- **b.** Issuing two (2) WC policies but used an "Officers and Directors Coverage Exclusion Endorsement-California" which OC had not filed with the Department.
  - 4. OC violated A.R.S. § 23-961(F) through its issuance of WC policies in which OC:
- a. Did not renew a WC policy but failed to send thirty (30) days' notice of nonrenewal to the insured;
  - b. Cancelled a WC policy for a reason other than nonpayment of premium;
- c. Cancelled a WC policy for nonpayment of premium but failed to send a notice of cancellation to the insured;
- d. Cancelled or non-renewed sixteen (16) WC policies, but failed to promptly notify the Industrial Commission of Arizona of any cancellation or nonrenewal; and
- e. Cancelled four (4) WC policies, but failed to send thirty (30) days' notice of cancellation to the insured.
- 5. OC issued a WC policy the file for which did not contain documentation of the NCCI experience modifier, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(B).

- 6. WA issued a WC policy and applied an experience modification different from the NCCI modification, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-357(E) and 20-359(A).
- 7. WA issued four (4) WC policies and OC issued four (4) WC policies on which both WA and OC violated A.R.S. §§ 20-357(E), 20-359(A), 20-400.01(A), and 20-400.01(B) by failing to document consideration experience rating ("ER") to eligible risks.
- **8.** WA issued five (5) WC policies and OC issued twenty-nine (29) WC policies without obtaining the signed Employee's Notice to Reject Terms of the Arizona Workers' Compensation Law Form for Officers and Directors, Form # ICA04-0113-78, in violation of A.R.S. § 23-906(A).
- 9. OC issued two (2) WC policies where the filed rates were not used, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-357(E), 20-359(A), 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(B).
- 10. OHIO issued a total of 43 policies in which the policy premium was financed with Ocasco Budget, Inc., a finance company that was not registered with the Department, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-220(A)(1) and 20-2002(A).
- 11. OHIO belongs to the Insurance Services Office ("ISO"), a property and casualty (P&C) rating organization duly licensed by the Department to file rates on behalf of its members. ISO files rates on behalf of OHIO, from which OHIO has filed various deviations. These rates are included in references contained on this Notice to OHIO's "filings" and "filed rates and rules."
  - 12. OHIO violated A.R.S. §§ 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(B) when:
- a. WA issued twenty six (26) Commercial Package ("CP") policies, OC one (1) automobile policy and AF issued two (2) General Liability ("GL") policies with undocumented IRPM/schedule/experience credits/debits;
- **b.** OHIO issued fifty-three (53) policies with inadequate documentation of IRPM and schedule credits/debits and thus containing no documented link between the credit/debit to risk characteristics; and

- c. OC and WA failed to document changes in the application of IRPM and schedule debits/credits to eight (8) policies.
- 13. WA issued nine (9) CP and three (3) CA policies with schedule credits/debits which exceeded individual risk characteristic maximums, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(B).
- 14. WA and AF documented IRPM/Schedule/experience credits/debits on two (2) GL policies and two (2) CP policies different from those credits/debits shown on the rating worksheets. As a result, these insureds paid more than if WA and AF had adhered to their filings, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(B).
- 15. OC and WA issued four (4) policies with IRPM and schedule credits/debits when the account did not qualify for IRPM/schedule rating ("SR"), in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A). As a result, the insureds paid less than if OC and WA had adhered to their filings.
- **16.** OC, WA and AF failed to document the consideration of SR to sixty-four (64) policies eligible for SR, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- 17. OC, WA and AF issued eight (8) GL policies and WA issued seven (7) CP policies in which schedule credits or debits were added together rather than applied consecutively as required by their filings, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- 18. OHIO violated A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A) by applying rates not filed with the Department by:
  - a. OHIO's issuance of eight (8) GL policies using unfiled (a) rates;
- **b.** WA and AF's issuance of five (5) GL policies with "A" rates different than the filed rates;
- c. OC's issuance of seven (7) GL policies and AF's issuance of two (2) GL policies using unfiled "A" rates;
  - d. WA and OC's issuance of nine (9) CP policies where unfiled "A" or (a) rates

were used. These policyholders paid less than they would have paid had OHIO adhered to their filings;

- e. Issuing seven (7) policies using unfiled rates for the Additional Insured Endorsement; and
- f. AF's issuance of one (1) GL policy and WA's issuance of two (2) GL policies in which OHIO used a rate which had not been filed with the Department.
- 19. OC and WA failed to document the consideration of the applicability of ER credits/debits to twenty-five (25) eligible policies, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- **20.** AF applied ER to one (1) policy although the insured was not eligible for ER, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- 21. WA issued two (2) CA policies without using actual manual premiums in the ER calculations, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A), 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(B).
- 22. OHIO issued nine (9) policies in which the policy files contain no documents to support or explain reductions in premiums other than notations suggesting that premiums had been reduced to meet the premium quotation an agent wanted or to meet a competing insurer's price, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-383(A), 20-448(C) and 20-451. On this basis, OHIO issued: (a) one (1) GL policies; (b) Five (5) CP policies; and (c) Three (3) CA policies.
  - 23. OC and WA violated OC §§ 20-383(A) and 20-400.01(A) by:
    - a. OC failing to apply the correct filed Experience Rating Table on one (1) policy;
- **b.** WA and OC did not apply the correct experience credit or debit from the ER tables on eleven (11) CA policies; and.
- c. WA issued one (1) GL policy with an experience credit different than the credit calculated.
  - 24. OC and WA violated OC §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A) when:

26

30. OHIO applied rates other than their filed rates in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A)

and 20-400.01(A) when:

- a. AF and WA issued two (2) GL policies using other than the correct filed rates;
- **b.** WA and OC issued six (6) CP policies without applying the correct filed rates for property coverage; and
- c. Using prior revision rates (old rates) instead of the current filed rates, OHIO issued two (2) GL policies and three (3) CP policies, resulting in insureds paying premiums different than the premiums that would have been charged if OHIO had adhered to its filings.
- 31. OC failed to use the filed deductible factor on one (1) GL policy in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- **32.** OC issued a CP policy and WA issued eight (8) CP policies without using the correct exposure base in development of the premium charged, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
  - 33. OHIO violated A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A) when:
    - a. AF extended the policy term on one (1) GL policy without a premium charge;
- **b.** WA issued six (6) CP policies adding increased coverage without a premium charge; and
- c. OC issued one (1) CA policy with hired automobile coverage without a premium charge for the hired automobile coverage.
- **34.** OC and WA did not apply their filed Company package modifier on ten (10) CP policies, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- 35. WA failed to use the correct territory in rating two (2) CP policies in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- **36.** WA failed to use the correct general liability classification on two (2) policies (one before the effective date of A.R.S. §20-400.01(A)) in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).

- 37. WA failed to apply its filed automobile classifications on thirteen (13) CA policies, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A), 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(C).
- **38.** WA issued one (1) CA policy and OC issued two (2) CA policies which did not have worksheet documentation in the file, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A), 20-400.01(A) and 20-400.01(B). Two (2) of these policies did not have worksheets showing the Accident Record Program (ARP) credits applied. The remaining policy did not have an experience or schedule rating worksheet in the file.
- **39.** OC issued one (1) CA policy and WA issued two (2) CA policies without applying the filed deviation, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- **40.** WA failed to apply fleet unit credits to thirty-five (35) CA policies, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A). According to WA's filing with the Department, the fleet unit credit plan is mandatory.
- **41.** WA issued three (3) CA policies and OC issued three (3) CA policies without applying the filed non-fleet ARP credits, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- **42.** WA issued five (5) CA policies in a deviated Company at non-deviated rates, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-385(A) and 20-400.01(A).
- **43.** OHIO selectively applied schedule rating to lines of coverage on two (2) policies in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-400.01(A) and 20-448(C).
- **44.** WA issued one (1) policy for private passenger use but wrote the policy on commercial policy forms, in violation of A.R.S. §§ 20-443(A) and 20-1113(B).
- 45. Grounds exist for the Director to impose a civil penalty upon OHIO pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 20-220, 20-397 and 20-400.03; and for the Director to order OHIO to reimburse insureds as set forth in the schedule attached as Exhibit "A"
  - 46. Grounds exist for the entry of all other provisions of the following Consent Order.

#### III. ORDER

OHIO having admitted the jurisdiction of the Director to enter this Consent Order, having waived the conduct of a Hearing, and having consented to the entry of this Consent Order, and there being no just reason for delay:

#### IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. OHIO shall cease and desist from:
- a. using rating procedures which result in of certain insureds paying different premiums than others having substantially like insuring, risk and exposure factors or expense factors, in violation of A.R.S. § 20-448;
- **b.** offering any reduction, rebate, discount, abatement, credit of premium as an inducement to insurance, in violation of A.R.S. § 20-451;
  - c. classifying risks other than pursuant to filed rates and rules;
  - d. charging rates other than those filed with the ADOI;
  - e. failing to file rates and rules with the ADOI;
- f. failing to develop and document premiums in accordance with experience rating and schedule rating plans;
  - g. failing to attach filed endorsements to policies as required by their filings;
- h. failing to send notices of general liability or commercial package premium increase, policy change or policy nonrenewal at least sixty (60) days before the expiration date of the coverage;
- i. failing to file all forms referenced above in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law;
- j. failing to use filed forms referenced above in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law;
  - k. failing to send notices of Workers' Compensation policy nonrenewal and

cancellation to the insureds;

2 3

Compensation policy cancellation or nonrenewal;

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1. failing to notify the Arizona Industrial Commission of Workers'
- financing premiums in Arizona through companies owned, managed, or m. controlled by OHIO but not authorized to do business in Arizona; and
- failing to obtain "Employee Notice to Reject Terms of the Arizona Workers' n. Compensation Law".
- 2. Pursuant to the written plan submitted by OHIO, a copy of which is attached and incorporated into this Consent Order as Exhibit B, OHIO shall:
  - a. comply with the provisions of Exhibit B; and
- b. provide ongoing training for all commercial underwriting personnel in all provisions of the statutes cited in this Consent Order.
- 3. Within ninety (90) days of the filed date of this Consent Order, OHIO shall file with the ADOI any rates, rules, deviations and forms used or intended to be used in Arizona which have not been filed with the ADOI.
- 4. OHIO shall ensure that all Premium Finance Companies directly or indirectly owned, managed, or controlled by OHIO which finance policies issued by OHIO to insureds in Arizona are authorized to do business in Arizona.
- 5. OHIO shall reimburse the sum of \$14,314.00 to policyholders for premium overcharges, plus interest at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum calculated from the date paid by the insured to the date of repayment to the insured as shown on the schedule attached as Exhibit "A". All reimbursements shall be accompanied by a letter acceptable to the Director, indicating why the refund is being sent. A list of reimbursements, giving the name of each policyholder reimbursed, the amount of the overcharge, the amount of interest paid, and the date of payment shall be filed with the ADOI within sixty (60) days of the filed date of this Consent

-11-

26

Consent Order.

OHIO CASUALTY GROUP-OVERCHARGES TO BE REIMBURSED

POLICY #	EFF. DATE	COMPANY	OVERCHARGE
BNW31-8890 BNW(92)5005-1304 BZW(90)50051516 BZW(91)50051516 BZW(88)304504 BZW(88)304504 XAW0031-2806 BKW(91)50047149 BLW(88)5006-4623 BLW(90)5002-1717 BLW(88)30-4627 BLW(92)5006-4623 BAW5037-4160 BAW5023-0133 BKW(89)50088426 BKW(90)5005-1435	10/7/90 5/1/91 8/11/89 8/11/90 8/11/91 1/1/87 1/1/88 3/29/88 5/10/90 11/6/87 4/25/89 2/28/87 11/6/91 4/11/90 7/31/90 11/20/88 8/1/89	WA WA WA WA WA WA WA WA WA WA WA	\$ 17.00 \$ 73.00 \$172.00 \$193.00 \$193.00 \$ 15.00 \$ 16.00 \$154.00 \$286.00 \$424.00 \$340.00 \$106.00 \$422.00 \$171.00 \$1,223.00 \$293.00
BKW(90)5004-7149 BKW(88)304504 XLW(88)34-1901	8/1/90 8/1/91 5/10/90 5/10/91 11/1/87 5/12/87	WA WA WA WA WA	(TOTAL 3 YEARS) \$381.00 (TOTAL 2 YEARS) \$ 15.00 \$1,010.00
BHA(89)5002-1618 BLA(89)0035-1328 BHA(90)5009-9105	2/25/88 11/17/89 10/31/89	AF AF AF	\$ 75.00 \$ 90.00 \$208.00
BKO(88)50033133 BA00034-2026 AC00961-0507 XN033-5608 BLO(91)5008-8319 BLO(92)5046-7910 BKO(90)50029134 BKO(90)50051423	7/18/87 6/14/89 11/28/87 1/7/88 9/14/90 6/8/91 3/23/89 8/4/89 8/4/90 8/4/91 9/15/88	0C 0C 0C 0C 0C 0C 0C 0C 0C	\$ 28.00 \$100.00 \$ 76.00 \$ 84.00 \$117.00 \$1,011.00 \$ 99.00 \$6,021.00 (TOTAL 3 YEARS) \$198.00

TOTAL \$14,314.00

### OHIO CASUALTY GROUP

## PROPOSED ACTION PLAN

- A. An internal audit team within the Phoenix Branch Office consisting of the Branch Office Manager, one Underwriting Supervisor and one Senior Rater will be established to review both new business and renewal business to ensure that:
  - Only rates, rating plans and rating rules filed with the ADOI have been used.
  - 2. That the facts to support the use of any credits/debits are documented in detail.
  - 3. The NCCI worksheet is completed and dated for Work Comp policies and includes documentation of risk characteristics supporting the use of any credits/debits.
  - 4. Filed rates and experience rating plans are applied consistently according to filed plans between insureds having like insuring risk, exposure and expense factors.

From the Company's monthly Premium Statements a random sample of both new and renewal business will be chosen for review.

Written results will be kept of audit findings.

B. A regularly scheduled Branch Office meeting will be devoted to a review of the Arizona Statutes cited in this Order, including adherence to Experience Rating and Schedule Rating plans and application of Experience Rating and Schedule Rating to all eligible insureds. This training shall include training in the documentation of policy files with information sufficient for the Examiners to verify how premiums were determined.

This will be reinforced by periodic (6 months) review of various Arizona Statutes cited. Further, the Branch Office Underwriting Staff has been furnished with an up to date version of the Arizona Insurance Laws for their daily reference.

Copy of the foregoing mailed/delivered this 26th day of April, 1994, to:

Gay Ann Williams, Deputy Director
Charles R. Cohen, Executive Assistant Director
Deloris E. Williamson, Assistant Director
Saul Saulson, Examination Supervisor
Lyn Sloan, Examiner
Department of Insurance
2910 N. 44th Street, Suite 210
Phoenix, Arizona 85018

Gregory Y. Harris Assistant Attorney General 1275 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Gregory Ong Hing Stockton & Hing 6609 N. Scottsdale Rd. Suite 202 Scottsdale, Arizona 85250

Chris Crawford